

1 LOUIS P. DELL, ESQ. (SBN 164830)  
2 LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS P. DELL  
3 715 South Victory Blvd.  
Burbank, CA 91502  
(818) 478-2822 (Office)  
(818) 436-5966 (Fax)  
4 e-mail: ldell@louisdell.com

5 Attorney for Plaintiff,  
6 CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS

7

8

9

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS, } CASE NO. 2:17-cv-02575  
13 Plaintiffs, } (to be related to  
14 vs. } 2:15-cv-05559-DMG-PLA)  
15 MCCARTHY, BURGESS & } NOTICE OF RELATED CASES  
16 WOLFF, INC, } [LR 83-1.3]  
and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive,  
17 Defendants. }

---

18

19 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:  
20 In accordance with Local Rule 83.1.3, Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS  
21 files this Notice of Related Cases. The instant case, *Phillips v. McCarthy, Burgess &*  
*Wolff, Inc*, 2:17-cv-02575, calls for a determination of the same or substantially  
22 identical questions of law and fact and, therefore, is likely to entail substantial  
23 duplication of labor, factual application, and legal analyses as in the prior case *Phillips*  
*v. Archstone Simi Valley LLC, et al.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-05559-DMG- PLA (Cal.  
24 Central District) (hereinafter, “Prior Case”).  
25  
26

1       1. These Cases Should Be Related Because They Arise from the Same or a  
2       Closely Related Transaction, Happening, or Event

3       Both cases involve debt collection of back-rent, attorney fees, late fees, and other  
4       charges arising from the same unlawful detainers. The court in Prior Case has ruled on  
5       motions for judgment on the pleadings (doc126) and motions for summary judgment  
6       (doc174) which have determined the invalidity of the debt for purposes of debt  
7       collection under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

8       2. Interests of Judicial Economy, and Consistency, the Two Cases Should Be  
9       Related

10      Identical legal issues are presented by these two cases and litigating them  
11     separately will create a substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges. In  
12     the Prior Case, Judge Dolly Gee recently ruled on the invalidity of the debt which is  
13     the very issue presented in the instant case and she is already familiar with the law and  
14     the facts. Although a final judgment is pending in the Prior Action, having another  
15     judge become familiar with the issues, when Judge Gee already is, will result in a  
16     substantial and expensive duplication of labor, and could result in inconsistent rulings.

17

18      Accordingly, these are Related Cases for the purposes of Local Rule 83.1.3.

19

20      Dated: April 4, 2017

LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS P. DELL

21

*/s/ Louis P. Dell*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Louis P. Dell, Esq.  
Attorney for Plaintiff,  
CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS

22

23

24

25

26

27

28